

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12, 14-16, 20, 24-29, 32-34, and 36-58 are pending in the application, with claims 14, 15, and 25 being withdrawn by the Examiner. Claims 2-4, 16, 25-29, 32-34, 36, and 39-44 have been amended, claims 5-8, 11, 13, 17-19, 21, 23, 30, 31, and 35 have been cancelled, and claims 45-58 have been added by this response. Reconsideration and allowance of Applicant's claims are respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiner Sax for granting an interview, and Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Sax for the courtesy extended during the interview of June 22, 2004. The following remarks are made in light of the interview and the amendments to the claims.

Claims 1-13, 16-23, and 25-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,819,284 to Farber et al. ("Farber") and U.S. Patent 6,317,789 to Rakavy et al. ("Rakavy"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Farber describes a system for implementing a personalized screensaver. As shown in FIG. 1 of Farber, a service node 120 includes a server 130 and an information feed interface 140. The server 130 is connected to personal computers 101 through telecommunications network 110. The information feed interface 140 is connected to server 130 and a plurality of information or content providers (e.g., a weather provider 150, a traffic provider 152, and a financial information provider 154).

The information feed interface 140 includes a plurality of clients 142-144 that each provide an interface to a corresponding one of the information providers (e.g., 150, 152, and 154). Each of the clients 142-144 includes local processors that may be configured to periodically connect to the associated information provider and download content that is available from the provider, or the clients may maintain a continuous communications link to the information provider and download or receive content.

When a user of a personal computer 101 initially arranges to use the service node 120, a personalized user profile is established, indicating the categories of information that the user desires to receive (e.g., sports, weather, investment advisories) and parameters that specify, for

that user, the exact information desired to be received in each category. If the user's personal computer display has remained inactive for a predetermined period of time, a screen saver is activated, causing the personal computer 101 to access the service node 120. The screen saver application transmits user identification and password data, previously stored in the screen saver application, to the service node 120. The personal computer requests content from the service node 120 that was obtained by the service node from a variety of sources, based on the user's individual profile. The service node 120 formats the content for display on the user's personal computer 101, the content is transmitted from the service node 120 to the personal computer, and the retrieved content is displayed on the personal computer by the screen saver.

Applicant's claim 1 recites, among other things, "An Internet-based computer network comprising: at least one client computer; a plurality of content provider computers; and a server computer; the client computer being programmed to gather personal preferences of a user of the client computer with respect to screensaver content and to cause the personal preferences to be sent to the server computer; the server computer being programmed to receive the personal preferences and to cause **meta information** to be sent to the client computer **identifying screensaver content** corresponding to the personal preferences; **the client computer being programmed to receive the meta information and, based on the meta information, to obtain the identified screensaver content directly from a plurality of the content provider computers in accordance with the user preferences.**" Neither Farber, nor Rakavy, alone or in combination, describe or suggest at least these features of Applicant's claim 1.

Farber's server 130 gathers information or content from the content providers 150, 152, 154 and "digests," stores, and arranges the content in individual databases within the service node 120. Furthermore, Farber states "What is essential to the present invention is that information 'feeds' received from multiple information sources are aggregated, re-formatted and stored in the service node, for later access by a user." After digesting the content, the server 130 transmits the content to the user in format that may be displayed by the user's personal computer. Farber does not transmit meta information that identifies the content, but rather transmits the actual content to the personal computer. In fact, Farber teaches away from Applicant's invention stating that the service node "in effect insulates information providers from **direct** connection to users, and assures that any necessary formatting and 'publishing' changes required for display by

the users display system are made.” (See, e.g., col. 1. l. 65 to col. 2 l. 7.) In marked contrast, Applicant’s claimed invention transmits meta information (e.g., reference information) identifying the content to the client device. The client device then uses the meta information to obtain the content directly from the content provider. In other words, Applicant’s client devices directly communicate with the content provider, whereas Farber insulates the user from direct communication with the content provider. Rakavy does not provide for any of the deficiencies of Farber.

Dependent claims 2-4 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claim 9 recites, among other things, “An Internet-based computer network comprising: a plurality of client computers corresponding to a community of users sharing a common screensaver; at least one content provider computer; and a server computer; each of the client computers being programmed to gather personal preferences of a user of the client computer with respect to screensaver content and to cause the personal preferences to be sent to the server computer; the server computer being programmed to receive the personal preferences from the plurality of client computers and to cause each of the plurality of client computers to receive, in common, screensaver content corresponding to the personal preferences received from each of the plurality of client computers corresponding to the community of users.” Farber and Rakavy, either alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest at least these features of Applicant’s claim 9.

Farber describes that a user profile database 174 contains information for each user of the system, specifying the categories or types of information services that are to be provided to that user, and, for those information services, the parameters that are associated with the desired information. For example, a first user may desire traffic, financial, and sports information, a second user may desire weather and news information, and a third user may desire traffic, news, and weather information. Farber goes on to state that for each of “these three users, the detailed information desired may be different. Thus, the first user may desire traffic information for certain roadways, financial information for certain securities, and sports information for particular teams. The second user may desire to obtain some of the same types of information, but the details will be different. In this example, the second user may desire local news and

weather for City A, while the third user may desire news and weather for a different location, City B.” Farber and Rakavy are both silent with regard to a specific community of users sharing a common screensaver. In marked contrast, Farber describes that each individual has a personalized screensaver and is silent with regard to sharing a common screensaver. Furthermore, Farber does not describe that the server 130 causes each of the plurality of client computers 101 to receive, in common, screensaver content corresponding to the personal preferences received from each of the plurality of client computers corresponding to the community of users. In contrast, a user of Farber receives content corresponding only to the personal preferences of *that particular user* and not the personal preferences of each computer in the community of users.

Dependent claim 10 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 9.

Claim 12 recites, among other things, “An Internet-based computer network comprising: **a plurality of client computers corresponding to a community of users sharing a common screensaver; at least one content provider computer; and a server computer; each of the client computers being programmed to receive content from the at least one content provider computer, to allow a user of the client computer to perform a single action indicating a desire to include the content in a screensaver program, and to transmit information to the server computer indicating the desire to include the content in the screensaver program; the server computer being programmed to receive the information indicating the desire to include the content in the screensaver program and to cause each of the plurality of client computers to receive, in common, the content for execution in the screensaver program.**” Farber and Rakavy, either alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest at least these features of Applicant’s claim.

As pointed out above, Farber and Rakavy, either alone or in combination, do not describe community of users sharing a common screensaver. Furthermore, neither Farber, nor Rakavy describe that one user may indicate to the server a desire to include content in the screen saver wherein the server causes each of the users to receive, in common, the content for execution by the screensaver. In contrast, a user of Farber provides personal preferences for *that particular user* only, and that particular user’s personal preferences do not affect a plurality of client computers in a community.

Claim 16 recites, among other things, "A method for implementing an Internet screensaver on a network, the network including at least one client computer, a plurality of content provider computers, and a server computer, the method comprising; gathering user preferences for content presented by the screensaver; transmitting the user preferences from the client computer to the server computer; receiving the user preferences at the server computer; identifying reference information to provide access to the content corresponding to the user preferences from one of the plurality of content provider computers; transmitting the reference information from the sever to the client computer through a first connection; receiving the reference information at the client computer; establishing a second connection from the client computer with one or more of the plurality of the content provider computers; accessing the content at the location using the reference information; and presenting one or more content items from the accessed content in the screensaver." Farber and Rakavy, either alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest at least these features of Applicant's claim 16.

In marked contrast to Applicant's claim 16, Farber describes that the personal computer establishes a connection to the service node 120 and downloads the content stored at the service node 120 corresponding to the user's personal profile. Farber does not describe transmitting reference information from the sever to the client computer through a first connection and receiving the reference information at the client computer. Nor does Farber describe establishing a second connection from the client computer with one or more of the plurality of the content provider computers and accessing the content at the location using the reference information. As pointed out above, Farber downloads the content to the personal computer (not reference information) and Farber teaches away from Applicant's claim by insulating the personal computer 101 from direct communication with the content provider 150. In addition, only one connection is made (i.e., the connection from the personal computer 101 to the service node 120).

Claims 20 and 36 are believed allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 9.

Claim 22 is believed allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 12.

Claim 25 is believed allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 16.

Dependent claims 24-29 and 32-34 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 25.

Claim 39 recites, among other things, "A computer-readable medium comprising instructions to cause a server processor to: receive user preferences for content presented by a screensaver of a client device; determine reference information including a location where content corresponding to the user preferences may be accessed from one of the plurality of content provider computers; and transmit the reference information identifying the location of the content corresponding to the received personal preferences in a format to allow a client device to communicate with and access the one or more content providers and present the content." Farber and Rakavy, either alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest at least these features of Applicant's claim 39.

As pointed out above, Farber does not provide reference information, but rather provides the actual content from the server to the personal computer. In addition, Farber does not describe or suggest (and in fact teaches away from) providing reference information in a format that allows the client device to communicate with the content provider.

Dependent claims 40-44 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 39.

It is respectfully submitted that Farber and Rakavy do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to Applicant's claimed invention, as neither Farber, nor Rakavy, alone or in combination, describe or suggest all features of Applicant's claims. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 12, 16, 20, 25-29, 32-34, and 36-44 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition to the claims presented above, Applicant has provided additional claims 45-58 to distinguish over the documents of record.

Applicant hereby requests a two month extension of time to September 9, 2004 for response to the office action of April 9, 2004. A check for the fee as required by 37 CFR § 1.17 accompanies this response.